

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 8, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated April 14, 2004 have been carefully reviewed. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 33-35, 42 and 60-65 are allowed.

Since Box No. 7 was not checked by the Examiner on the Advisory Action (PTOL-303), Applicants do not know if the previously-filed amendments were entered into the application. However, since only claims 37 and 38 were previously amended and those claims are now canceled, it is believed that the present amendment is in proper form.

In order to expedite prosecution of this application, claims 36-40 have been newly canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claims 36-40 in one or more divisional and/or continuation patent applications.

The only claims now pending in this application are those which the Examiner indicated as allowed in the Advisory Action. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Response to the objections to the claims due to informalities

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claim 37 because "it starts with an improper article"

In order to advance prosecution, Applicants have newly canceled claim 37 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection.

Response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (first paragraph)

Claims 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In order to advance prosecution, Applicants have newly canceled claims 36-40 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 38 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention.

In order to advance prosecution, Applicants have newly canceled claim 38 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

The foregoing amendments and remarks are being made to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner has indicated that all of the now-pending claims are allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: May 11, 2004

By:


Erich E. Veitenheimer
Reg. No. 40,420

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000